

in the White House and the Republicans in charge of the House and the Senate, that the debt of the United States of America has increased by 62 percent, over \$8 trillion. They are borrowing \$1.4 billion a day to run the government. They are borrowing every penny of the Social Security surplus and spending it on other things, including tax cuts for the wealthy.

Now they want to cut. What do they want to cut? Students loans, Medicare, Medicaid, foster care, and other programs that are important to struggling American families, under the guise of fiscal responsibility.

Now they want to do \$50 billion of cuts, but they also want to do \$70 billion of tax cuts for the wealthiest among us. They want to make permanent the cuts in capital gains taxes. They want to reward wealth, not work; and they want to make permanent the cuts in dividend taxes. In order to facilitate that, they want to cut these other programs.

They want to benefit approximately 1 percent of the society, those who earn over \$300,000 a year and have estates worth more than \$6 million. But one thing we have got to give them is they are relentless and consistent and they are successful. Last year, the IRS says that 99 percent of the people in America saw their real incomes decline. Everybody who earned less than \$300,000 after inflation saw a decline. Up to \$1.3 million, they did okay. Over \$1.3 million, they did phenomenally well. Now the President's Tax Commission says that is exactly what the future should be. That is trickle down. We want more for the wealth, not for those who work.

Their proposals are extraordinary. They would say that dividends should be free of tax. So if one is someone who is lucky enough to be born into a wealthy family, they inherit millions of dollars and they invest it in dividend-paying stocks, they would never pay a penny in Federal taxes because they are a wealth creator, they are a job generator, they are trickling down on the rest of America. Is that not nice of them? But they would not contribute to the society.

And then we have stocks. Well, on stocks they want to say 75 percent of the gain should be tax-free, again benefiting, for the most part, the same people. But the funny thing they are doing here is they want to talk about wealth creators and entrepreneurs, but they stick it to the small business people.

If one has a small business, they build it up and they sell it for a million bucks, guess what? Their tax rate is 33 percent under the President's new proposal. But if they have been speculating in the stock market, they would only have to pay at 8 percent. If they had been happy enough or lucky enough to inherit money and clip dividend coupons, they would have paid 0 percent. But, no, if they built up their small business, they are going to pay 33 percent; and those suckers who work

for a living, they will pay on every penny of income. Somebody who earns \$25,000 a year will pay a tax rate at about three times the person who invests in stocks and realizes capital gains.

This is their vision of the world: trickle down economics, trickling on the majority of America and last year trickling on 99 percent of the people in America. It is working well, they say, and we should do more of the same. And, ironically, they want to borrow money to perpetuate this. They are going to take all the Social Security surplus and spend it in part to finance these long-term tax cuts for the wealthiest among us.

They should be ashamed, and trickle-down economics does not work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CAMDEN COUNTY LANDFILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, most of us believe we are sent to Washington, DC, to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the people we represent. I rise today with deep concern that the inaction of two Federal agencies is threatening the welfare of my constituents and the environmental treasures of my district.

As I speak, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency are sitting on their hands witnessing the possible construction of one of the largest landfills in America near the Virginia-North Carolina border.

While it saddens me that the elected officials of one of North Carolina's most beautiful counties would pollute their community with the garbage of over 20 States, I do not represent that county. However, when the safety and drinking water of my constituents and the ecological health of my district is put at risk, I cannot remain silent.

Camden County, North Carolina, has approved a mega-landfill to be located less than 1,000 yards south of the City of Chesapeake, Virginia, and adjacent to two environmental treasures: the Dismal Swamp Canal and the Dismal Swamp National Wildlife Refuge.

This mega-landfill will cover almost 500 acres, reach a height of 280 feet, extend 2.5 miles in length, and upon full construction will be visible 20 miles away. The giant landfill would cram the garbage of over 100 million people in over 20 States into a county with less than 9,000 people. Garbage from New York City would be barged in mass into a tidewater port and transported via a fleet of 1,000 garbage truck trips per day on congested roads and bridges, including the Federally-funded Route 17, which connects Virginia and North Carolina.

One would trust that, given something of this magnitude, that careful consideration, study, and deliberation would have been conducted prior to approval. One would trust that, since this mega-landfill will be situated in the midst of one of the most ecologically valuable wetland areas on the East Coast, that public hearings were held, detailed surveys conducted, and scientists and ecologists consulted. One would trust that, given the fact that this landfill would be situated in a flood zone and within storm surge area for major hurricanes, that emergency plans had been formulated and Federal agencies sought for advice. One would certainly trust the very people who live, work, and rear their children in this area would have had an opportunity for public input.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. No water quality studies were conducted by the Corps, no ecological studies performed by the EPA, no Federal advice, no warnings.

But here is the real issue: Had this dump site been proposed less than 1,000 yards north in Virginia, it would have been subject to all the appropriate scrutiny. There would have been public input, Federal agency comment, analysis of alternative sites, and environmental studies, all because the site would have been located within a different district of the Army Corps.

□ 2115

How is it that on one side of the border small farmers and businesses are subject to intense scrutiny from the Army Corps, whereas on the other side of the border a 500-acre landfill does not even raise a Federal eyebrow? And if dumping 83 million tons of garbage in a flood zone does not require the EPA to do an environmental study, what does?

It is inconceivable to me that the Federal Government is allowing bureaucratic entanglements and inertia to obstruct its most primary duty, to protect the citizens and resources of the United States. I urge General Strock and the Army Corps of Engineers to resolve the internal discrepancies that allow a landfill that impacts two areas so similarly to be treated so differently. And I call upon the Environmental Protection Agency to step up to the task they have been charged with, to protect the environment and preserve it for our children and grandchildren.